

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS SEP 24 2001

TENTH CIRCUIT

PATRICK FISHER
Clerk

VAN STAFFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,
vs.

NORMAN L. ARENDS; LARRY
PORTER; TOM BILLINGS;
CLINTON HOEFFNER,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 01-1044
(D.C. No. 01-N-2)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **EBEL, KELLY, and LUCERO**, Circuit Judges.**

Mr. Van Stafford, who appears pro se in this action, is a frequent litigant in the federal courts.¹ In this case, he appeals from the district court's dismissal of

* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. This court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

** After examining the briefs and the appellate record, this three-judge panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not be of material assistance in the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The cause is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

¹ Although Mr. Stafford has been sanctioned on numerous occasions for frivolous litigation, see Stafford v. United States, 208 F.3d 1177, 1178 (10th Cir. 2000) (collecting cases), no prior sanctions or filing restrictions are applicable to this action.

his complaint against various Colorado state officials. Although we hold pro se complaints to “less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,” Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), Mr. Stafford’s complaint is completely unintelligible. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court’s order (Doc. 4), we AFFIRM.

Entered for the Court

Paul J. Kelly, Jr.
Circuit Judge